

Brent Local Plan

Examination Stage Proposed Modifications Representation Form Council Reference Number: 24 a

Representations on the proposed modifications must be received by the Council by 5pm 19th August 2021.

All the representations should be submitted to planning Policy Team Leader, Brent Civic Centre, Engineer's Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ. Ideally provide your response in Word or similarly editable document formats. This will make it easier for us to summarise representations and speed up the process of reporting to the Inspectors.

Data Protection

The personal information you provide on this form will be processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and the Privacy and Electronic Communications (EC Directive) Regulations 2003. It may be used by the Council, the Planning Inspectors or the Local Plan Programme Officer to contact you, if necessary, regarding your submission. All representations including all accompanying personal data will be sent to the appointed Planning Inspectors undertaking the Local Plan examination. Please see the Council's planning and Planning Inspectorate's privacy notices

Your name, organisation name (if relevant) and comments will be made available for public inspection when displaying and reporting the outcome of the consultation. No other personal data will be displayed. No anonymous representations will be accepted.

If you consent the Council will place your details on our Planning Policy consultation database and inform you of any next stages in the Local Plan adoption process.

I <u>wish</u> to be informed of the next stages, such as publication of the Inspectors recommendations or the adoption of the Local Plan - **delete as appropriate**.

If you consent, the Council will also retain your details to inform you of any further planning policy consultations, such as any review of the Local Plan, Community Infrastructure Levy, Supplementary Planning Documents, Article 4 Directions, conservation area/ other heritage asset reviews and neighbourhood planning.

I <u>do not wish</u> to be informed of other planning policy consultations - **delete as appropriate**.

Please sign and date this form. Forms signed electronically or with typeset will be accepted.

Declaration:

By completing and signing this form, <u>I agree to the above use of data submitted</u> in association with my representations.

Signature: Da	ate: 17.08.2021
---------------	-----------------

This form has two parts –

not subject to delay)

Part A – Personal Details: need only be completed once.
Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

Part A		
	opointed, please complete only the Title s below but complete the full contact d	
Title		
First Name		
Last Name		
Job Title (where relevant) Organisation (where relevant) Address Line 1		
Line 2		
Line 3		
Line 4		
Post Code		
Telephone Number		
	sist in communicating with you nsuring the examination process is	

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation: 3. To which proposed modification does this representation relate? Modification MM79 Reference e.g. MM1 4. Do you consider the Local Plan is: 4.(1) Legally compliant Yes No X 4.(2) Sound Yes No X 4.(3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate Yes X No Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments. Objection is made to the allocation of 303-309 Cricklewood Broadway for residential and industry (LP Ref: BSESA35). It has only recently been brought to the objector's attention that such allocation is being made and appears to be based upon an incorrect assumption as to the existing use of the site overall. This is stated to be "storage". This is correct with regard to that part of the site containing Nos. 303-307 but not Nos. 307-309, which for many years has been the Manor Health and Leisure Club operating on all five floors of the building. At the present time the objector, who owns both properties, is not anticipating redevelopment in the immediate future although there is the prospect of change of use to the upper floors of Nos. 307-309. Should redevelopment be considered in the future, then a residential content could well be expected but the inclusion of an industrial element where none currently exists in what is primarily a residential area will not be a viable option. Such use would be potentially damaging to the residential environment and prejudicial to the overall prospects of redevelopment. Furthermore, the site is of insufficient size to accommodate both residential (Class C3) and industrial uses (Class B2) bearing in mind, in particular, an industrial use will inevitably require on-site servicing facilities.	
Modification Reference e.g. MM1 4. Do you consider the Local Plan is: 4.(1) Legally compliant Yes X No 4.(2) Sound Yes No Yes No Please tick as appropriate 5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments. Objection is made to the allocation of 303-309 Cricklewood Broadway for residential and industry (LP Ref: BSESA35). It has only recently been brought to the objector's attention that such allocation is being made and appears to be based upon an incorrect assumption as to the existing use of the site overall. This is stated to be "storage". This is correct with regard to that part of the site containing Nos. 303-307 but not Nos. 307-309, which for many years has been the Manor Health and Leisure Club operating on all five floors of the building. At the present time the objector, who owns both properties, is not anticipating redevelopment in the immediate future although there is the prospect of change of use to the upper floors of Nos. 307-309. Should redevelopment be considered in the future, then a residential content could well be expected but the inclusion of an industrial element where none currently exists in what is primarily a residential area will not be a viable option. Such use would be potentially damaging to the residential environment and prejudicial to the overall prospects of redevelopment. Furthermore, the site is of insufficient size to accommodate both residential (Class C3) and industrial uses (Class B2) bearing in mind, in particular, an industrial use will inevitably require on-site servicing facilities.	
Reference e.g. MM1 4. Do you consider the Local Plan is: 4.(1) Legally compliant Yes X No 4.(2) Sound Yes No No X 4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate Yes X No Please tick as appropriate 5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments. Objection is made to the allocation of 303-309 Cricklewood Broadway for residential and industry (LP Ref: BSESA35). It has only recently been brought to the objector's attention that such allocation is being made and appears to be based upon an incorrect assumption as to the existing use of the site overall. This is stated to be "storage". This is correct with regard to that part of the site containing Nos. 303-307 but not Nos. 307-309, which for many years has been the Manor Health and Leisure Club operating on all five floors of the building. At the present time the objector, who owns both properties, is not anticipating redevelopment in the immediate future although there is the prospect of change of use to the upper floors of Nos. 307-309. Should redevelopment be considered in the future, then a residential content could well be expected but the inclusion of an industrial element where none currently exists in what is primarily a residential area will not be a viable option. Such use would be potentially damaging to the residential environment and prejudicial to the overall prospects of redevelopment. Furthermore, the site is of insufficient size to accommodate both residential (Class C3) and industrial uses (Class B2) bearing in mind, in particular, an industrial use will inevitably require on-site servicing facilities.	3. To which proposed modification does this representation relate?
4.(2) Sound Yes No X 4.(3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate Yes X No Please tick as appropriate 5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments. Objection is made to the allocation of 303-309 Cricklewood Broadway for residential and industry (LP Ref: BSESA35). It has only recently been brought to the objector's attention that such allocation is being made and appears to be based upon an incorrect assumption as to the existing use of the site overall. This is stated to be "storage". This is correct with regard to that part of the site containing Nos. 303-307 but not Nos. 307-309, which for many years has been the Manor Health and Leisure Club operating on all five floors of the building. At the present time the objector, who owns both properties, is not anticipating redevelopment in the immediate future although there is the prospect of change of use to the upper floors of Nos. 307-309. Should redevelopment be considered in the future, then a residential content could well be expected but the inclusion of an industrial element where none currently exists in what is primarily a residential area will not be a viable option. Such use would be potentially damaging to the residential environment and prejudicial to the overall prospects of redevelopment. Furthermore, the site is of insufficient size to accommodate both residential (Class C3) and industrial uses (Class B2) bearing in mind, in particular, an industrial use will inevitably require on-site servicing facilities.	Reference e.g. MM1
4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate Yes X No Please tick as appropriate 5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments. Objection is made to the allocation of 303-309 Cricklewood Broadway for residential and industry (LP Ref. BSESA35). It has only recently been brought to the objector's attention that such allocation is being made and appears to be based upon an incorrect assumption as to the existing use of the site overall. This is stated to be "storage". This is correct with regard to that part of the site containing Nos. 303-307 but not Nos. 307-309, which for many years has been the Manor Health and Leisure Club operating on all five floors of the building. At the present time the objector, who owns both properties, is not anticipating redevelopment in the immediate future although there is the prospect of change of use to the upper floors of Nos. 307-309. Should redevelopment be considered in the future, then a residential content could well be expected but the inclusion of an industrial element where none currently exists in what is primarily a residential area will not be a viable option. Such use would be potentially damaging to the residential environment and prejudicial to the overall prospects of redevelopment. Furthermore, the site is of insufficient size to accommodate both residential (Class C3) and industrial uses (Class B2) bearing in mind, in particular, an industrial use will inevitably require on-site servicing facilities.	4.(1) Legally compliant Yes X No
4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate Yes X No Please tick as appropriate 5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments. Objection is made to the allocation of 303-309 Cricklewood Broadway for residential and industry (LP Ref: BSESA35). It has only recently been brought to the objector's attention that such allocation is being made and appears to be based upon an incorrect assumption as to the existing use of the site overall. This is stated to be "storage". This is correct with regard to that part of the site containing Nos. 303-307 but not Nos. 307-309, which for many years has been the Manor Health and Leisure Club operating on all five floors of the building. At the present time the objector, who owns both properties, is not anticipating redevelopment in the immediate future although there is the prospect of change of use to the upper floors of Nos. 307-309. Should redevelopment be considered in the future, then a residential content could well be expected but the inclusion of an industrial element where none currently exists in what is primarily a residential area will not be a viable option. Such use would be potentially damaging to the residential environment and prejudicial to the overall prospects of redevelopment. Furthermore, the site is of insufficient size to accommodate both residential (Class C3) and industrial uses (Class B2) bearing in mind, in particular, an industrial use will inevitably require on-site servicing facilities.	` '
5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments. Objection is made to the allocation of 303-309 Cricklewood Broadway for residential and industry (LP Ref: BSESA35). It has only recently been brought to the objector's attention that such allocation is being made and appears to be based upon an incorrect assumption as to the existing use of the site overall. This is stated to be "storage". This is correct with regard to that part of the site containing Nos. 303-307 but not Nos. 307-309, which for many years has been the Manor Health and Leisure Club operating on all five floors of the building. At the present time the objector, who owns both properties, is not anticipating redevelopment in the immediate future although there is the prospect of change of use to the upper floors of Nos. 307-309. Should redevelopment be considered in the future, then a residential content could well be expected but the inclusion of an industrial element where none currently exists in what is primarily a residential area will not be a viable option. Such use would be potentially damaging to the residential environment and prejudicial to the overall prospects of redevelopment. Furthermore, the site is of insufficient size to accommodate both residential (Class C3) and industrial uses (Class B2) bearing in mind, in particular, an industrial use will inevitably require on-site servicing facilities.	4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate Yes No
unsound of fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments. Objection is made to the allocation of 303-309 Cricklewood Broadway for residential and industry (LP Ref: BSESA35). It has only recently been brought to the objector's attention that such allocation is being made and appears to be based upon an incorrect assumption as to the existing use of the site overall. This is stated to be "storage". This is correct with regard to that part of the site containing Nos. 303-307 but not Nos. 307-309, which for many years has been the Manor Health and Leisure Club operating on all five floors of the building. At the present time the objector, who owns both properties, is not anticipating redevelopment in the immediate future although there is the prospect of change of use to the upper floors of Nos. 307-309. Should redevelopment be considered in the future, then a residential content could well be expected but the inclusion of an industrial element where none currently exists in what is primarily a residential area will not be a viable option. Such use would be potentially damaging to the residential environment and prejudicial to the overall prospects of redevelopment. Furthermore, the site is of insufficient size to accommodate both residential (Class C3) and industrial uses (Class B2) bearing in mind, in particular, an industrial use will inevitably require on-site servicing facilities.	Please tick as appropriate

6. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 5 above. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to cooperate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if

Please be as precise as possible. In the light of the incorrect assessment of existing use and now the revised wording identifying the Council's proposed allocated uses, the objector would wish to see the site allocation removed completely due to of impracticability in promoting the redevelopment of the site in the manner suggested. It is noted that the modification comments anticipate that "the maximum viable provision of industrial floorspace will be required as part of any redevelopment". This phrase has little meaning and belies the inability of the site to perform effectively in the provision of two potentially conflicting uses. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) Please note In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspectors, based on the matters and issues they identify for examination. 7. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)? **No.** I do not wish to **Yes**, I wish to participate in participate in Χ hearing session(s) hearing session(s) Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate. 8. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.

Please note the Inspectors will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspectors have identified the matters and issues for examination.

Guidance Note to Accompany Model Representation Form

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Council has proposed modifications to the Brent Local Plan that it has been submitted for examination by the appointed Planning Inspectors. It is only the proposed modifications and associated documents that are subject to consultation. All previous representations received on the submitted Plan have been considered by the Inspectors as part of the examination process to date and do not need to be re-submitted, or additional points made on them. The *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004*, as amended, [PCPA] states that the purpose of the examination is to consider whether the plan complies with the relevant legal requirements, including the duty to co-operate, and is sound. The Inspectors will consider all representations on the plan that are made within specified consultation periods.
- 1.2. To ensure an effective and fair examination, it is important that the Inspector and all other participants in the examination process are able to know who has made representations on the plan. The LPA will therefore ensure that the names of those making representations can be made available and taken into account by the Inspector.

2. Legal Compliance and Duty to Co-operate

- 2.1. You should consider the following before making a representation on legal compliance:
- The plan should be included in the Council's current Local Development Scheme [LDS] and the key stages set out in the LDS should have been followed. The LDS is effectively a programme of work prepared by the Council, setting out the plans it proposes to produce. It will set out the key stages in the production of any plans which the Council proposes to bring forward for examination. If the plan is not in the current LDS it should not have been published for representations. The LDS should be on the Council's website and available at its main offices.
- The process of community involvement for the plan in question should be in general accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement [SCI]. The SCI sets out the Council's strategy for involving the community in the preparation and revision of plans and the consideration of planning applications.
- The Council is required to provide a Sustainability Appraisal [SA] report when it publishes a plan. This should identify the process by which SA has been carried out, and the baseline information used to inform the process and the outcomes of that process. SA is a tool for assessing the extent to which the plan, when judged against reasonable alternatives, will help to achieve relevant environmental, economic and social objectives.
- The plan should be in general conformity with the London Plan (formally known as the Spatial Development Strategy).
- The plan should comply with all other relevant requirements of the PCPA and the *Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012*, as amended [the Regulations].
- 2.3. You should consider the following before making a representation on compliance with the duty to co-operate:

- Section 33A of the PCPA requires the Council to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities and certain other bodies over strategic matters during the preparation of the plan. The Council will be expected to provide evidence of how they have complied with the duty.
- Non-compliance with the duty to co-operate cannot be rectified after the submission of the plan. Therefore, the Inspector has no power to recommend modifications in this regard. Where the duty has not been complied with, the Inspector cannot recommend adoption of the plan.

3. Soundness

- 3.1. The tests of soundness are set out in paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Plans are sound if they are:
- Positively prepared providing a strategy which, as a minimum seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs, and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring authorities is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;
- **Effective** deliverable over the plan period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and
- **Consistent with national policy** enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF.
- 3.2. If you think the content of the plan is not sound because it does not include a policy on a particular issue, you should go through the following steps before making representations:
- Is the issue with which you are concerned already covered specifically by national planning policy or the London Plan?
- Is the issue with which you are concerned already covered by another policy in this plan?
- If the policy is not covered elsewhere, in what way is the plan unsound without the policy?
- If the plan is unsound without the policy, what should the policy say?

4. General advice

- 4.1. If you wish to make a representation seeking a modification to a plan or part of a plan you should set out clearly in what way you consider the plan or part of the plan is legally non-compliant or unsound, having regard as appropriate to the soundness criteria in paragraph 3.1 above. Your representation should be supported by evidence wherever possible. It will be helpful if you also say precisely how you think the plan should be modified.
- 4.2 You should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification. You

should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. Any further submissions after the plan has been submitted for examination may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies.

- 4.3. Where groups or individuals share a common view on the plan, it would be very helpful if they would make a single representation which represents that view, rather a large number of separate representations repeating the same points. In such cases the group should indicate how many people it is representing and how the representation has been authorised.
- 4.4. Please consider carefully how you would like your representation to be dealt with in the examination: whether you are content to rely on your written representation, or whether you wish to take part in hearing session(s). Only representors who are seeking a change to the plan have a right to be heard at the hearing session(s), if they so request. In considering this, please note that written and oral representations carry the same weight and will be given equal consideration in the examination process.